Journal of Politeness Research: Introduction

VAN DER BOM, Isabelle and GRAINGER, Karen <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-9379-4361>

Isabelle van der Bom and Karen Grainger

Journal of Politeness Research: Introduction

DOI 10.1515/pr-2015-0007

Abstract: This issue marks the 10th year anniversary of the *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, behaviour, culture*. Ten years ago, founding Editor-in-Chief Christine Christie established the journal as an "international and multidisciplinary forum for research into linguistic and non-linguistic politeness phenomena" (Christie 2005: 1). Under her editorial guidance, the journal published a great number of papers which embodied this founding principle. In 2010, Derek Bousfield and Karen Grainger took over the editorship and in 2013 Karen Grainger became the sole Editor-in-Chief, and the *Journal of Politeness Research* has grown and matured further under the stewardship of Bousfield and Grainger. Today, with the invaluable contributions of authors and reviewers, and the continuous support of the journal's readership, editorial team and advisory board, the journal remains a flagship for and a pioneer of research into all kinds of politeness phenomena. To celebrate this 10th year anniversary, it is worth reviewing in detail what has been achieved so far, and to take a look at promising future developments of politeness research.

2005–2010: Conception and early years

In the early 2000s, research on linguistic and non-linguistic politeness phenomena was already flourishing in a diverse number of disciplines, not in least thanks to the seminal publication of Penelope Brown and Stephen Levinson's (1987 [1978]) book *Politeness: Universals in Language Usage*. Despite the surge of research in politeness in the field of pragmatics and a diverse number of other disciplines, including sociolinguistics, social anthropology, cultural studies, sociology, communication studies, computing, psychology, gender studies, and business, there was no unified platform to bring these different publica-

Isabelle van der Bom, University of Sheffield, UK and Associate Lecturer at Sheffield Hallam University, UK, E-mail: i.vanderbom@sheffield.ac.uk
Karen Grainger, Sheffield Hallam University, Sheffield, UK, E-mail: k.p.grainger@shu.ac.uk

tions on politeness together. However, in 1998 the Linguistic Politeness Research Group was formed by a collection of scholars from English Universities. This group agreed there was a need for a peer-reviewed journal that provided a focussed outlet for politeness research, and in 2005, the first issue of the *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, behaviour, culture* was launched.

In the introduction to the first issue, then Editor-in-Chief Christine Christie evidences the need for a journal of politeness research by reviewing a select number of publications on politeness in a diverse number of fields. She points out that the diversity of research output on politeness in journals in disparate fields has meant that important empirical studies and theoretical insights that have the potential to advance the field are not easily accessible, and therefore not capable of contributing to its further advancement as much as they could (and should). The aim of Christie and her colleagues on the editorial board was to provide such a unified platform, one that brings together key theoretical debates which enable advancement of theory, and endorses empirical studies that broaden our understanding of social and cultural phenomena and that contribute to the development of methodologies for describing and explaining politeness phenomena.

As Bousfield and Grainger (2010) note, under Christie's editorship, the first few years of the journal established it as a cohesive and high impact outlet for research on politeness across disciplines, languages, cultures and contexts. Papers published in the journal have often contributed to the development of the field in multiple areas at once, and they reflect scope, applicability, importance and impact. It is impossible to capture the richness of publications in the journal in this period within the limitations of this introduction, but one such significant publication of this time is Locher and Watts' (2005) conceptualization of relational work as key to coming to a better understanding of "politeness". The field was also advanced by other theoretical explorations, such as Holtgraves' (2005) exploration of politeness as a social construct, Terkourafi's (2005) "frame-based" view, Spencer-Oatey's (2005) approach of rapport management, Arundale's (2006) constructivist notion of face, O'Driscoll (2007) on Face-Threatening Acts (FTAs), Christie (2007) on the relation between Relevance Theory and politeness, and Haugh's (2007) methodical critique of the discursive approach to politeness. Arundale (2006), for instance, argues that different from Brown and Levinson's (1987) dialectical understanding, "face" is a dynamic phenomenon reflective of the co-constructed nature of self in interaction. His conceptualization of face as both relational and interactional has been influential in moving the field forward, and Arundale's (2006) article has also inspired debate about the relation between face and identity (see Garcés-Conejos Blitvich et al. 2013).

This period furthermore saw the application of politeness to a range of different languages and cultures such as French (Beeching 2006; Kerbrat-Orecchioni 2006), Spanish (Arnáiz 2006; Márquez Reiter 2008; Félix-Brasdefer 2008), Greek, (Koutsantoni 2007; Bella 2009), Turkish (Daller and Yıldız 2006), Chinese (Kádár 2007), Korean (Byon 2006), Setswana (Kasanga and Lwanga-Lumu 2007), Israeli (Kampf and Blum-Kulka 2007), Japanese (Pizziconi 2007) and Persian (Sharifian 2008). The special issues encouraged the extension of politeness research to different contexts, such as "Politeness at work" (guest edited by Mills and Beeching 2006), "Politeness in health care settings" (guest edited by Mullany 2009) and "Politeness and impoliteness in computer-mediated communication (CMC)" (guest edited by Locher 2010). It is also worth mentioning the extensive work that has been published on speech acts (e.g., Kampf and Blum-Kulka 2006; Wouk 2006; Davies et al. 2007; Ogiermann 2009), including a special issue on Apologies in 2007 (guest edited by Grainger and Harris). Also in this period, there were important developments and conceptualizations of impoliteness (e.g., Culpeper 2005; Piirainen-Marsh 2005), helped along by the publication of a special issue on Impoliteness in 2008, guest edited by Bousfield and Culpeper. There can be little doubt that the Journal helped in establishing the study of impoliteness as one of the most fruitful and stimulating lines of enquiry in the field.

Finally, it is important to acknowledge the contribution during this period of the late Geoffrey Leech. In volume 3(2) of the Journal (2007), he proposed a new pragmatic framework for studying linguistic politeness phenomena in communication. His proposed model comprises a common principle of politeness (Leech 1983, 2003, 2005) and a Grand Strategy of Politeness (GSP), which he claimed allowed for explanation of communicative politeness phenomena in Eastern languages as well as in Western languages. This chapter appeared remodelled in his 2014 publication of *The pragmatics of politeness*.

2010–2015: Further growth and maturation

In 2010, Derek Bousfield and Karen Grainger took over the editorial role from Christine Christie. In the opening editorial of their first co-edited journal issue, they note that the first issue of the first volume of the *Journal of Politeness Research* featured research "discussing and (re)introducing issues and positions which were to presage many of the debates that we see in current issues of the journal" (Bousfield and Grainger 2010: 162). Indeed from 2010 onwards the journal has taken forward key debates around politeness as relational work

(Zayts and Schnurr 2013; Estellés Arguedas and Albelda Marco 2014; Grainger et al. 2015), rapport management (García 2012), politeness as identity work (Garcés-Conejos Blitvich et al. 2013; Georgakopoulou 2013), politeness as facework (Al-Adaileh 2011; Kádár and Roe 2012; Hatfield and Hahn 2014), the interrelations between identity and face (Bucholtz and Hall 2013; Joseph 2013; Miller 2013) and fundamental epistemological questions such as the role of the analyst (Haugh 2012; Kádár and Mills 2013). An example is the special issue guest-edited by Garcés-Conejos Blitvich (2013) on identity and facework. Garcés-Conejos Blitvich points out that the advent of discursive approaches to politeness has problematized the strict boundary between "face" and "identity". In her introduction, she investigates the interrelationships of these two concepts, questioning whether their theoretical conceptualization as discrete phenomena is justified and to which extent face and identity can also be seen as fuzzy or overlapping concepts. Her comprehensive theoretical overview is one of the most downloaded articles of the *Journal of Politeness Research*. It provides both a reflection for what has been done in the area until then, and a starting point for future work on politeness and identity, whilst the other articles collected in the special issue inform theoretical debate with contributions of empirical evidence (Georgakopoulou 2013; Joseph 2013; Miller, 2013; Garcés-Conejos Blitvich et al. 2013) and further theoretical reflection (Bucholtz and Hall 2013).

This period saw further theoretical debate on the basis of empirical findings (e.g., Cook 2012; Hasegawa 2012; Clark 2013; Schlund 2014) and expansion of existing topics and the introduction of exciting new avenues in the field, such as advancement of research on impoliteness (e.g., Bayraktaroğlu and Sifianou 2012; Dynel 2012; Mugford 2012). The journal also encouraged scholarship on an increasingly varied set of contexts, cultures and languages. For example, 2011 saw the publication a special issue on politeness research across legal contexts (Archer 2011a, 2011b; Cecconi 2011; Harris 2011; Johnson and Clifford 2011; Luchjenbroers and Aldridge 2011; Tracy 2011), and papers on historical politeness (Archer 2011b; Cecconi 2011; King 2011; Terkourafi 2011; Kádár 2012), the prosodic expression of linguistic (im)politeness in Romance languages (Estellés Arguedas and Albelda Marco 2014; Gili Fivela and Bazzanella 2014, Hidalgo Navarro and Cabedo Nebot 2014; García Negroni and Caldiz 2014; Devís Herraiz and Cantero Serena 2014) and politeness research in Africa (Bouchara 2015; Grainger et al. 2015; Hampel 2015; Johns and Félix-Brasdefer 2015; Lauriks et al. 2015; Makoni 2015). These latter two special issues have arisen out of the need to expanding politeness research to other geographical areas (also see Brown 2010, 2013; Kádár and Mills 2013; Hatfield and Hahn 2014; Peterson and Vaattovaara 2014) and to further investigating politeness in non-verbal forms, such as the complex relationship between prosody and politeness. As Hidalgo

Navarro (2014: 1) notes, the phonic aspect of (im)politeness is still emerging. A similar perspective is taken by McKinnon and Prieto (2014: 189) and Mapson (2014). Mapson examines non-manual features (typically seen to be part of prosody) in British Sign Language, and points out that "the breadth of literature on linguistic politeness in spoken languages is not reflected in the more specialized field of sign linguistics" (Mapson 2014: 161). Her analysis problematizes the categorization of politeness strategies in frameworks developed on spoken languages (e.g., Blum-Kulka et al. 1989) and posits the need for further research into the area of sign language and politeness, for example in the form of further cross-linguistic studies between British Sign Language and American Sign Language.

2015 and beyond: retrospect and prospect in politeness research

Looking back over research published in the *Journal of Politeness Research: Language, behaviour, culture* over the years, several key themes emerge. These relate to the development of politeness theory and practical applications of politeness methodology in different topic areas, languages and cultures, as well as in a variety of mediums of communication. When looking at theoretical development of politeness theory, it is useful to employ Grainger's (2011) distinction of politeness research into three waves (also see Culpeper 2011; and Kádár and Haugh 2013). Following Grainger (2011: 169), the first wave of politeness theory contains research by Brown and Levinson (1978, 1987) Leech (1983) and Lakoff (1973, 1989), and is predominantly informed by J. L. Austin's (1962) and Paul H. Grice's (1975) work. The second wave of politeness research can be attributed to critiques (e.g., Eelen 2001; Mills 2003; Watts 2003, 2005) of Gricean approaches to politeness, and is mainly informed by the "discursive turn" in politeness research (e.g., Locher 2004, 2006a, 2006b; Locher and Watts 2005; Linguistic Politeness Research Group 2011; Mills 2011). The third wave Grainger introduces captures sociological/interactional approaches to politeness such as those put forward by O'Driscoll (2007), Arundale (2006), Haugh (2007), and Terkourafi (2005). From these three waves, the *Journal of Politeness Research* has published research that predominantly falls into the second and third wave. Perhaps this is a result of the time in which the journal came into existence, but it also seems this is where current research on politeness theory is at.

The collection of research in the present issue can be seen to belong to both second and third wave approaches of politeness research, with contributions from van der Bom and Mills on discursive politeness and Mitchell and Haugh's conceptualization of (im)politeness as social practice falling more clearly into the second and third waves of politeness research. Van der Bom and Mills' paper aims to provide an exemplification of the way that the discursive approach can work in relation to the analysis of data. They first trace the development of the discursive approach to politeness and address its critiques, and then argue that discursive approaches should be seen as constituting an approach to the *analysis* of politeness rather than mostly a critique. They support their argumentation by providing step-by-step discursive analysis, discussing the selecting of an extract of a conversation between a group of close friends of Dutch and Italian origin, the examination of interactants' evaluations and interaction itself, as well as the different resources (Agha 2006) participants bring to the discourse. As such, this paper is very accessible to both undergraduate and graduate students with an interest in politeness (see Christie 2005: 1), and might serve useful in teaching the discursive approach to students.

Mitchell and Haugh's paper is exemplary of the third wave of politeness research. In their study, they provide an insightful analysis of agency in relation to social action, arguing that a focus on agency in theorizing impoliteness allows for an understanding of how producers can be held accountable for impolite stances because of their presumed agency, while recipients do not just simply invoke social norms or perceived speaker intentions when evaluating a producer's talk or behaviour as impolite, but can also be seen to display their own agency (to various degrees) in construing the speaker's actions as a particular kind of action. Thus, when one interactant in the dataset is asked about an interlocutor's negative response, he makes it clear that his evaluation of the response is derived from him exercising agency in choosing how to respond. Their argument is grounded in the idea that evaluations of impoliteness necessarily involve evaluators as construing the speaker's action as a particular kind of *social action*, and holding them accountable for that particular kind of social action in relation to particular aspects of the moral order (Haugh 2013, 2015). They support their claims by a close interactional analysis of instances of potentially impolite actions in interactions between Australians and Americans. Mitchell and Haugh's paper is particularly insightful because it opens up a new perspective on evaluations of (im)politeness. Their use of the term *agency* can be seen as a form of mediation that lies between norms of politeness and (perceived) speaker intentions, and as such it allows for an understanding of how recipients evaluating interaction are affected by norms of politeness while ac-

counting for individual differences across speaker evaluations of (im)politeness in interaction. It should also be noted that this research furthermore incorporates research on Haugh's (2015) three stage conceptualization of the moral order (Haugh 2015), leaving ample of scope for further exploration of agency, politeness and the moral order.

Situating her paper within second wave politeness research, Fukushima argues for a greater consideration of *attentiveness*. She notes that with the development of interpersonal pragmatics, there has been a growing need to investigate interpersonal relationships and greater importance is placed on evaluation in the discursive approach. *Attentiveness* is a concept that serves both these developments and takes into account (im)politeness from a non-linguistic perspective, thus contributing to a deeper understanding of politeness that encompasses both linguistic and non-linguistic (im)politeness more generally. In her paper, Fukushima defines *attentiveness* at length, comparing it to the notion of *heart* and *omoiyari*, and then offers a model of detailing the stages leading up to the demonstration of attentiveness.

Dynel provides a state-of-the-art overview of impoliteness studies, and indicates a few prospective research directions to enrich them. In the first part of her paper, she reviews a number of current methodological and theoretical issues that give rise to continuous debates, such as the problem of using labels, the status of (perceived) speaker intention, the conceptualization of sanctioned face-threat, the tenability of impoliteness taxonomies, and impoliteness formulae. The second part of her comprehensive overview is an exploration into a variety of different discourse domains, with suggestions for possible routes for further research in the field of impoliteness studies.

Kádár and Márquez Reiter offer a socio-pragmatic examination of instances of what is generally known in social psychology as "bystander intervention". Their paper reflects a growing interest in the moral and emotional bases of polite behaviour, which arguably is a predictable development of studies on impoliteness and evaluations of politeness. Kádár and Márquez Reiter draw on the work of scholars such as Holtgraves (2005) and Spencer-Oatey (2007) in arguing that more scholarly attention should be paid to the neglected aspect of the relationship between (im)politeness and (im)morality. In doing so, they propel current research on (im)politeness forward by offering analysis of a yet unexplored territory: that of the interface between metapragmatics, (im)politeness and (im)morality in the interactional arena of bystander intervention. Kádár and Márquez Reiter draw on instances of bystander intervention in the US T.V. reality show *Primetime: What Would You Do?,* analyzing four interactions of bystander intervention. In contrast to Mitchell and Haugh (this issue), Kádár and Márquez Reiter argue that morality is not a social practice in and of itself

per se, but rather a phenomenon that people perceive and define. Their paper offers valuable insight into issues of first and second order politeness, by examining participants' action of intervening and the way in which this is articulated (politeness1) in relation to theoretical conceptualizations of ritual, (im)politeness and (im)morality, as well as participants' metacommunicative orientations to (im)politeness and (im)morality.

While the majority of the papers in this special issue deal with spoken face-to-face interaction, Maíz-Arévalo's paper on jocular mockery in computer-mediated communication (CMC) represents an important and growing area of research into politeness in mediated contexts. In a guest-edited special issue on CMC, Locher (2010: 3–4) already pointed out that there is still ample scope for integrating politeness research further into CMC data analyses in other fields, and notes the need for politeness scholars to focus attention to online interaction to a greater extent. Locher stipulates we should pay more attention to CMC data because of the potential it offers to examine the negotiation of norms and politeness, the relation between face, identity and online communication, and the ways in which forms of computer-mediated communication differ from face-to-face interaction (taking into account restrictions that the medium). Maíz-Arévalo's paper caters for these points by examining how jocular mockery plays out and contrasts in two distinct on-line communities: one Spanish and one English. Her examination addresses the following questions:

(i) What triggers jocular mockery in the Spanish and the British corpora?
(ii) How is jocular mockery "framed" by the participants? and
(iii) How do interlocutors respond to it?

Data not only provide insight into the lesser explored dimensions of politeness and CMC communication, notably jocular mockery in particular, but also reveals how data relate to constructions of self-identity and face.

As is visible in the scope of papers selected for this special issue, we have aimed to reflect both the diversity of themes in politeness research studied at the moment, and the recent advancements and trends in the field. The topics included in this issue range from discursive politeness, to politeness as social action, the relationship between politeness and morality, linguistic and non-linguistic politeness, politeness in computer-mediated communication and impoliteness. Regrettably, it is beyond the scope of this issue to provide a fully comprehensive collection of the politeness articles on emerging and expanding aspects of the field. It is hoped, however, that it provides an indication of where the field currently stands theoretically and methodologically. We hope this issue serves as a significant contribution to the advancement of the field, and

that the *Journal of Politeness Research* continues to serve as a catalyst for innovation in politeness studies.

Collectively, the papers that have been published in the *Journal of Politeness Research* so far epitomize our commitment to developing politeness research in lesser-studied cultures and languages, and our aims to continue the further theoretical and methodological development of the field. The journal has played a pivotal role in establishing politeness research worldwide, and we continue to encourage contributions from lesser-studied cultures, language and topic areas for future research.

The editorial team is grateful for the substantial contribution of the reviewers, scholars, colleagues at DeGruyter, and the advisory board in making this journal a success.

We look forward to the continued growth and new developments of the journal in the years to come.

References

Agha, Asif. 2006. *Language and social relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Al-Adaileh, Bilal. 2011. When the strategic displacement of the main topic of discussion is used as a face-saving technique: Evidence from Jordanian Arabic. *Journal of Politeness Research* 7(2). 239–257.

Archer, Dawn (ed.) 2011a. Special issue. Facework and im/politeness across legal contexts: An introduction. *Journal of Politeness Research* 7(1). 1–19.

Archer, Dawn. 2011b. Libelling Oscar Wilde: The case of Regina vs. John Sholto Douglas. *Journal of Politeness Research* 7(1). 73–99.

Arnáiz, Carmen. 2006. Politeness in the portrayal of workplace relationships: Second person address forms in Peninsular Spanish and the translation of humour. *Journal of Politeness Research* 2(1). 123–141.

Arundale, Robert B. 2006. Face as relational and interactional: A communication framework for research on face, facework and politeness. *Journal of Politeness Research* 2(2). 193–216.

Austin, John. L. 1962. *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bayraktaroğlu, Arin & Maria Sifianou. 2012. The iron fist in a velvet glove: How politeness can contribute to impoliteness. *Journal of Politeness Research* 8(2). 143–160.

Beeching, Kate. 2006. Politeness markers in French: Post-posed quoi in the tourist office. *Journal of Politeness Research* 2(1). 143–167.

Bella, Spyridoula. 2009. Invitations and politeness in Greek: The age variable. *Journal of Politeness Research* 5(2). 243–271.

Blum-Kulka, Shoshana, Juliane House & Gabriele Kasper (eds.). 1989. *Cross-cultural Pragmatics: Requests and apologies*, Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing.

Bouchara, Abdelaziz. 2015. The role of religion in shaping politeness in Moroccan Arabic: The case of the speech act of greeting and its place in intercultural understanding and misunderstanding. *Journal of Politeness Research* 11(1). 71–98.

Bousfield, Derek & Jonathan Culpeper (eds.). 2008. Special issue. Impoliteness: Eclecticism and diaspora. *Journal of Politeness Research* 4(2).
Bousfield, Derek & Karen Grainger 2010. Politeness research: Retrospect and prospect. *Journal of Politeness Research* 6(2). 161–82.
Brown, Lucien. 2010. Politeness and second language learning: The case of Korean speech styles. *Journal of Politeness Research* 6(2). 243–269.
Brown, Lucien. 2013. "Mind your own esteemed business": Sarcastic honorifics use and impoliteness in Korean TV dramas. *Journal of Politeness Research* 9(2). 159–186.
Brown, Penelope & Stephen C. Levinson. 1987 [1978]. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Bucholtz, Mary & Kira Hall. 2013. Epilogue: Facing identity. *Journal of Politeness Research* 9(1). 123–132.
Byon, Andrew Sangpil. 2006. The role of linguistic indirectness and honorifics in achieving linguistic politeness in Korean requests. *Journal of Politeness Research* 2(2). 247–276.
Cecconi, Elisabetta. 2011. Power confrontation and verbal duelling in the arraignment section of XVII century trials. *Journal of Politeness Research* 7(1). 101–121.
Christie, Christine. 2005. Editorial. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1(1). 1–7.
Christie, Christine. 2007. Relevance theory and politeness. *Journal of Politeness Research* 3(2). 269–294.
Clark, Jodie. 2013. 'Maybe she just hasn't matured yet': Politeness, gate-keeping and the maintenance of status quo in a community of practice. *Journal of Politeness Research* 9(2). 211–237.
Cook, Haruko Mineghishi. 2012. A response to "Against the social constructionist account of Japanese politeness". *Journal of Politeness Research* 8(2). 269–276.
Culpeper, Jonathan. 2005. Impoliteness and entertainment in the television quiz show: *The Weakest Link*. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1(1). 35–72.
Culpeper, Jonathan. 2011. Politeness and impoliteness. In Gisle Andersen & Karin Aijmer (eds.), *Handbooks of pragmatics* (vol. 5), 391–436. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Daller, Helmut & Cemal Yıldız. 2006. Power distance at work: The cases of Turkey, successor states of the former Soviet Union and Western Europe. *Journal of Politeness Research* 2(1). 35–53.
Davies, Bethan L., Andrew Merrison & Angela Goddard. 2007. Institutional apologies in UK higher education: Getting back into the black before going into the red. *Journal of Politeness Research* 3(1). 39–63.
Devís Herraiz, Empar & Francisco José Cantero Serena. 2014. The intonation of mitigating politeness in Catalan. *Journal of Politeness Research* 10(1). 127–149.
Dynel, Marta. 2012. Setting our house in order: The workings of impoliteness in multi-party film discourse. *Journal of Politeness Research* 8(2). 161–194.
Eelen, Gino. 2001. *A critique of politeness theories*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
Estellés Arguedas, Maria & Marta Albelda Marco. 2014. Evidentials, politeness and prosody in Spanish: A corpus analysis. *Journal of Politeness Research* 10(1). 29–62.
Félix-Brasdefer, J. César. 2008. Sociopragmatic variation: Dispreferred responses in Mexican and Dominican Spanish. *Journal of Politeness Research* 4(1). 81–110.
Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, Pilar, Patricia Bou-Franch and Nuria Lorenzo-Dus. 2013. Identity and impoliteness: The expert in the talent show Idol. *Journal of Politeness Research* 9(1). 97–121.

García, Carmen. 2012. Complimenting professional achievement: A case study of Peruvian Spanish speakers. *Journal of Politeness Research* 8(2). 223–244.
Georgakopoulou, A. 2013. Small stories and identities analysis as a framework for the study of im/politeness-in-interaction. *Journal of Politeness Research* 9(1). 55–74.
Garcés-Conejos Blitvich, Pilar (ed.). 2013. Special issue. Face, identity and im/politeness. *Journal of Politeness Research* 9(1).
García, Carmen. 2012. Complimenting professional achievement: A case study of Peruvian Spanish speakers. *Journal of Politeness Research* 8(2). 223–244.
García Negroni, María Marta & Adriana Caldiz 2014. Prosody, polyphony and politeness. A polyphonic approach to prosodic configurations common to French and Spanish. *Journal of Politeness Research* 10(1). 63–96.
Gili Fivela, Barbara & Bazzanella, Carla. 2014. The relevance of prosody and context to the interplay between intensity and politeness. An exploratory study on Italian. *Journal of Politeness Research* 10(1). 97–126.
Grainger, Karen. 2011. "First order" and "second order" politeness: Institutional and intercultural contexts. In Linguistic Politeness Research Group (ed.). *Discursive approaches to politeness*. 167–188. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Grainger, Karen & Sandra Harris (eds.). 2007. Special issue. Apologies. *Journal of Politeness Research* 3(1).
Grainger, Karen, Zainab Kerkam, Fathia Mansor & Sara Mills. 2015. Offering and hospitality in Arabic and English. *Journal of Politeness Research* 11(1). 41–70.
Grice, Paul. 1975. *Logic and conversation*. In Peter Cole & Jerry L. Morgan (eds.), Syntax and semantics (vol. 3: Speech acts), 41–58. London: Academic Press.
Hampel, Elisabeth. 2015. "Mama Zimbi, pls help me!" Gender differences in (im)politeness in Ghanaian English advice-giving on Facebook. *Journal of Politeness Research* 11(1). 99–130.
Harris, Sandra. 2011. Epilogue: Facework and im/politeness across legal contexts. *Journal of Politeness Research* 7(1). 147–152.
Hasegawa, Yoko. 2012. Against the social constructionist account of Japanese politeness. *Journal of Politeness Research* 8(2). 245–268.
Hatfield, Hunter and Jee-Won Hahn. 2014. The face of others: Triadic and dyadic interactions in Korea and the United States. *Journal of Politeness Research* 10(2). 221–245.
Haugh, Michael. 2007. The discursive challenge to politeness research: An interactional alternative. *Journal of Politeness Research* 3(2). 295–317.
Haugh, Michael. 2012. Epilogue: The first-second order distinction in face and politeness research. *Journal of Politeness Research* 8(1). 111–134.
Haugh, Michael. 2013. Speaker meaning and accountability in interaction. *Journal of Pragmatics* 48. 41–56.
Haugh, Michael. 2015. *Im/politeness implicatures*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Hidalgo Navarro, Antonio (2014) Introduction. Special issue. The prosodic expression of linguistic im/politeness in Romance languages. *Journal of Politeness Research* 10(1). 1–4.
Hidalgo Navarro, Antonio & Adrián Cabedo Nebot. 2014. On the importance of the prosodic component in the expression of linguistic im/politeness. *Journal of Politeness Research* 10(1). 5–27.
Holtgraves, Thomas. 2005. Social psychology, cognitive psychology, and linguistic politeness. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1(1). 73–93.

Johns, Andrew & Félix-Brasdefer, J. César. 2015. Linguistic politeness and pragmatic variation in request production in Dakar French. *Journal of Politeness Research* 11(1). 131–164.
Johnson, Alison & Ruth Clifford. 2011. Polite incivility in defensive attack: Strategic politeness and impoliteness in cross-examination in the *David Irving vs. Penguin Books Ltd and Deborah Lipstadt* trial. *Journal of Politeness Research* 7(1). 43–71.
Joseph, John E. 2013. Identity work and face work across linguistic and cultural boundaries. 35–54. *Journal of Politeness Research* 9(1). 35–54.
Kádár, Dániel Z. 2007. On historical Chinese apology and its strategic application. *Journal of Politeness Research* 3(1). 125–150.
Kádár, Dániel Z. 2012. Historical Chinese politeness and rhetoric. A case study of epistolary refusals. *Journal of Politeness Research* 8(1). 93–110.
Kádár, Dániel Z. & Keith Roe (eds.). 2012. Special issue. Chinese 'face' and im/politeness: An introduction. *Journal of Politeness Research* 8(1).
Kádár, Dániel Z. & Michael Haugh. 2013. *Understanding politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Kádár, Dániel Z. & Sara Mills. 2013. Rethinking discernment. *Journal of Politeness Research* 9(2). 133–158.
Kampf, Zohar & Shoshana Blum-Kulka. 2007. Do children apologize to each other? Apology events in young Israeli peer discourse. *Journal of Politeness Research* 3(1). 11–37.
Kasanga, Luanga A. & Joy-Christine Lwanga-Lumu. 2007. Cross-cultural linguistic realization of politeness: A study of apologies in English and Setswana. *Journal of Politeness Research* 3(1). 65–92.
Kerbrat-Orecchioni, Catherine. 2006. Politeness in small shops in France. *Journal of Politeness Research* 2(1). 79–103.
King, Jeremy. 2011. Power and indirectness in business correspondence: Petitions in Colonial Louisiana Spanish. *Journal of Politeness Research* 7(2). 259–283.
Koutsantoni, Dimitra. 2007. "I can now apologize to you twice from the bottom of my heart": Apologies in Greek reality TV. *Journal of Politeness Research* 3(1). 93–123.
Lakoff, Robin T. 1973. The logic of politeness: Or minding your P's and Q's. *Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistics Society,* 292–305.
Lakoff, Robin. 1989. The limits of politeness: Therapeutic and courtroom discourse. *Multilingua* 8. 101–129.
Lauriks, Sanne, Ian Siebörger & Mark De Vos. 2015. "Ha! Relationships? I only shout at them!" Strategic management of discordant rapport in an African small business context. *Journal of Politeness Research* 11(1). 7–39.
Leech, Geoffrey. 1983. *Principles of pragmatics*. New York: Longman.
Leech, Geoffrey. 2003. Towards an anatomy of politeness in communication. *International Journal of Pragmatics* 14. 101–123.
Leech, Geoffrey. 2005. Politeness: Is there an East-West Divide? *Wai Guo Yu: Journal of Foreign Languages* 160(6). 3–31.
Leech, Geoffrey. 2007. Politeness: Is there an East-West divide? *Journal of Politeness Research* 3(2). 167–206.
Leech, Geoffrey. 2014. *The pragmatics of politeness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Linguistic Politeness Research Group. 2011. *Discursive approaches to politeness*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Locher, Miriam. A. 2004. *Power and politeness in action: Disagreements in oral communication*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Locher, Miriam A. 2006a. Polite behaviour within relational work: The discursive approach to politeness. *Multilingua* 25(3). 249–267.
Locher, Miriam A. 2006b. The discursive approach to polite behaviour. *Language in Society* 35(5). 733–735.
Locher, Miriam A. (ed.). 2010. Special issue. Politeness and computer-mediated communication. *Journal of Politeness Research* 6(1).
Locher, Miriam A. & Richard J. Watts. 2005. Politeness theory and relational work. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1(1). 9–33.
Luchjenbroers, June & Aldridge-Waddon, Michelle. 2011. Paedophiles and politeness in email communications: Community of practice needs that define face-threat. *Journal of Politeness Research* 7(1). 21–42.
Makoni, Sinfree. 2015. Introduction: Politeness in Africa. *Journal of Politeness Research* 11(1). 1–5.
Mapson, Rachel. 2014. Polite appearances: How non-manual features convey politeness in British Sign Language. *Journal of Politeness Research* 10(2). 157–184.
Márquez Reiter, Rosina. 2008. Intra-cultural variation: Explanations in service calls to two Montevidean service providers. *Journal of Politeness Research* 4(1). 1–29.
McKinnon, Sean and Pilar Prieto. 2014. The role of prosody and gesture in the perception of mock impoliteness. *Journal of Politeness Research* 10(2). 185–219.
Miller, Elizabeth R. 2013. Positioning selves, doing relational work and constructing identities in interview talk. *Journal of Politeness Research* 9(1). 75–95.
Mills, Sara. 2003. *Gender and politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Mills, Sara. 2011. Discursive approaches to politeness and impoliteness. In Linguistic Politeness Research Group (ed.), *Discursive approaches to politeness*. 19–56. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Mills, Sara & Kate Beeching (eds.). 2006. Special issue. Politeness at work. *Journal of Politeness Research* 2(1).
Mugford, Gerrard. 2012. I wouldn't say that if I were you: Face-to-face with foreign-language impoliteness. *Journal of Politeness Research* 8(2). 195–221.
Mullany, Louise (ed.). 2009. Special issue. Politeness research and health communication. *Journal of Politeness Research* 5(1).
O'Driscoll, Jim. 2007. What's in an FTA? Reflections on a chance meeting with Claudine. *Journal of Politeness Research* 3(2). 243–268.
Ogiermann, Eva. 2009. Politeness and in-directness across cultures: A comparison of English, German, Polish and Russian requests. *Journal of Politeness Research* 5(2). 189–216.
Peterson, Elizabeth and Johanna Vaattovaara. 2014. Kiitos and pliis: The relationship of native and borrowed politeness markers in Finnish. *Journal of Politeness Research* 10(2). 247–269.
Piirainen-Marsh, Arja. 2005. Managing adversarial questioning in broadcast interviews. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1(2). 193–217.
Pizziconi, Barbara. 2007. The lexical mapping of politeness in British English and Japanese. *Journal of Politeness Research* 3(2). 207–241.
Schlund, Katrin. 2014. On form and function of politeness formulae. *Journal of Politeness Research* 10(2). 271–296.
Sharifian, Farzad. 2008. Cultural schemas in L1 and L2 compliment responses: A study of Persian-speaking learners of English. *Journal of Politeness Research* 4(1). 55–80.

Spencer-Oatey, Helen. 2005. (Im)Politeness, face and perceptions of rapport: Unpackaging their bases and interrelationships. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1(1). 95–119.
Spencer-Oatey, Helen. 2007. Theories of identity and the analysis of face. *Journal of Pragmatics* 29(4). 639–656.
Terkourafi, Marina. 2005. Beyond the micro-level in politeness research. *Journal of Politeness Research* 1(2). 237–262.
Terkourafi, Marina. 2011. From Politeness1 to Politeness2: Tracking norms of im/politeness across time and space. *Journal of Politeness Research* 7(2). 159–185.
Tracy, Karen. 2011. A facework system of minimal politeness: Oral argument in appellate court. *Journal of Politeness Research* 7(1). 123–145.
Watts, Richard J. 2003. *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Watts, Richard J. 2005. Linguistic politeness research: Quo vadis? In Richard J. Watts,
Sachiko Ide & Konrad Ehlich (eds.), *Politeness in language: Studies in its history, theory and practice,* 2nd edn., xi–xlvii. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
Wouk, Fay. 2006. Strategies of apologizing in Lombok Indonesia. *Journal of Politeness Research* 2(2). 277–311.
Zayts, Olga & Stephanie Schnurr. 2013. "[She] said: 'take the test' and I took the test". Relational work as a framework to approach directiveness in prenatal screening of Chinese clients in Hong Kong. *Journal of Politeness Research* 9(2). 187–210.